## REMARKS

The Office Action of March 9, 2007 subjected claims 1-32 to a restriction requirement

into two groups, Group I, claims 1-18 drawn to a PEM fuel cell, and Group II, claims 19-30

drawn to a method. Applicants respectfully point out to the Examiner that this is a divisional

application of parent application, U.S. Serial No. 09/997,190 and further directs the Examiner's

attention to the Preliminary Amendment filed on February 3, 2004 which canceled claims 1-18

on the same day that this application was filed.

To advance prosecution, Applicants hereby formally elect to prosecute the invention of

Group II, claims 19-30, and further formally elect the species of Group II-2, claims 22-25 with

traverse.

Applicants maintain that the Examiner has failed to carry the burden of establishing the

requirement for restriction and respectfully requests withdrawal of the same. Again, Applicants

point out that the product claims in Group I, and the method claims in Group II are related to

each other as a product and methods of making the same. The inventions in Group I and II are

not independent because there is a disclosed relationship between the inventions. Examples of

two different combinations with no disclosed relationship would be an article of apparel and a

locomotive bearing. See MPEP 806.06. Because the inventions are not independent of each

other, the restriction requirement is improper. Further, with respect to the election of species

requirement, the Examiner has not established that examination of the three species would create

a burden on the Examiner. Withdrawal of the restriction and election of species requirements is

respectfully requested.

Serial No. 10/770,876
Page 8

Applicants respectfully request notice of allowance of claims 19-36 now in the case.

Respectfully submitted,

REISING, ETHINGTON, BARNES, KISSELLE, P.C.

Cary W. Brooks
Registration No. 33,361
P. O. Box 4390
Troy, MI  48099-4390
(248) 689-3500

Dated:  May 2, 2007